REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 2, 4 through 6, 12 through 16, 19 through 24, and 29 through 41 are pending, with Claims 2, 12, 22, 29, 34, 36, 38, and 40 being independent. Claims 7 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice. The independent claims have been amended.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended in granting and conducting on November 18, 2003, a personal interview with Applicant's representative. At the interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 1st paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, which are respectfully traversed, as well as proposed amendments to the claims. Applicant respectfully understands that the Examiner is in tentative agreement that the proposed amendments would obviate the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, and the claims have been amended as discussed at the interview.

At the interview, the Examiner inquired which disclosed embodiments satisfied the claimed Fourier transform relation. In response, Applicant is providing the following Table, which addresses this inquiry:

TABLE

embodiment, figure, and description	Fourier transform relation satisfied
1 (Fig. 8) lens plus lens	yes
2 (Fig. 10) optical rod plus lens	no
3 (Fig. 12) lens plus lens plus optical rod	no
4 (Fig. 13) lens plus lens	yes
5 (Fig. 14) fly's eye lens plus lens	no

With further reference to this Table, Applicant respectfully notes the following: (1) regarding Embodiment 2 (Fig. 10), surfaces 17 and 20 are in a Fourier transform relation; (2) regarding Embodiment 3 (Fig. 12), where the two lenses 12 and the optical rod 22 are considered the converting optical system and the fiber bundle is taken as the light transmitting element, then the Fourier transform relation is not satisfied, whereas if the two lenses 12 were considered the converting optical system and the optical rod were taken as the light transmitting element, then the Fourier transform relation is satisfied; (3) regarding Embodiment 4 (Fig. 13), where the two lenses 10 and 11 are considered as the converting optical system, and the optical rod 42 is taken as the light transmitting element, then the Fourier transform relation is satisfied.

The Examiner also inquired what structure other than the two lens structure of Fig. 8 could be used to achieve the Fourier transform relation. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that a Fourier transform relation could also be achieved by, for example, (a) two lens surfaces of a single lens (see, e.g., items 17 and 20 in Fig. 10) or (b) one or more mirrors, among other structures.

With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, as discussed at the interview, Applicant respectfully submits that U.S. Patent No. 5,218,660 (Omata) fails to disclose or suggest the Fourier transform relation as claimed.

Applicant earnestly believes that the foregoing addresses the Examiner's inquiries, and respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned representative if any further questions should arise.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel S. Glueck

Attorney for Applicant
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/dc

DC_MAIN 150958v1